

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

IRA J. GAINES and LANNY LAHR,

Plaintiffs

v.

BRIAN KEASBERRY and AARIF JAMANI,

Defendants

AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS
AND THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01206-APG-VCF

Order Granting in Part Motion to Dismiss

[ECF No. 9]

Plaintiffs Ira Gaines and Lanny Lahr sue defendants Brian Keasberry and Aarif Jamani for the alleged fraudulent transfer of Series A Preferred stock in a company called Gen2 Technologies, Inc. (Gen2). ECF No. 6. Keasberry and Jamani filed an answer and counterclaim against Gaines, Lahr, Daniel Serruya, and Michael Kovacocy. ECF No. 7 at 10. Keasberry and Jamani asserted claims for civil conspiracy and aiding and abetting against all counterdefendants, and breach of fiduciary duty and equitable indemnity against Serruya and Kovacocy.¹

Gaines and Lahr move to dismiss the counterclaims on a variety of grounds. Keasberry and Jamani oppose. I grant the motion in part, with leave to amend.

I. BACKGROUND²

Keasberry founded Gen2 and served as its president, chief executive officer (CEO), secretary, treasurer, and as a director until he resigned in July 2017. ECF No. 7 at 11. In 2016,

¹ Keasberry and Jamani also asserted claims for concert of action and abuse of control, but they agree those claims should be dismissed. ECF No. 11 at 9, nn.5-6.

² The background section is taken from the counterclaimants' allegations, which I take as true at this stage of the proceedings. *Kwan v. SanMedica Int'l*, 854 F.3d 1088, 1096 (9th Cir. 2017).

1 while Keasberry was still in control of Gen2, Gen2 entered into two promissory notes to raise
2 money for the company, one with Gaines and one with Lahr, each with a maturity date of
3 February 10, 2017. *Id.* at 16. Keasberry personally guaranteed the notes if Gen2 did not repay
4 the debt. *Id.* Gen2 did not repay the debt by the original maturity date. *Id.*

5 In June 2017,³ Gen2's board of directors approved the creation of Series A Preferred
6 stock, which was a single share issued to Keasberry that entitled him to voting power equal to
7 110% of Gen2's common stock. *Id.* at 11-12. Keasberry thus had the voting power to elect new
8 directors at a shareholder meeting and maintain control of Gen2 after his resignation. *Id.* at 12.

9 In July 2017, Serruya took over as president and CEO, and was a director of Gen2. *Id.*
10 Serruya hired Kovacocy. *Id.* According to the counterclaims, Serruya began diluting the
11 shareholders' equity and paid out over \$2 million in compensation to the company's officers and
12 directors. *Id.* Additionally, the counterclaims allege that Serruya and Kovacocy deliberately
13 failed to repay the promissory notes that Keasberry guaranteed during their tenure. *Id.* at 16.

14 In November 2020, Keasberry and Jamani executed a stock purchase agreement under
15 which Jamani agreed to purchase the Series A stock for \$30,000. *Id.* at 18. Jamani was to pay
16 \$20,000 within six months of the date of the agreement, and the stock would be transferred to
17 him after he did so. *Id.*

18 In February 2021, Keasberry (who still owned the Series A stock) used his majority
19 voting power to elect himself and Jamani as Gen2's directors, after which they held a board
20 meeting and removed Serruya as president and CEO. *Id.* at 12. Keasberry and Jamani appointed

21
22 ³ The counterclaims identify this date as June 2018, but this appears to be a typographical error
23 because the Series A Preferred stock was meant to maintain Keasberry's control over Gen2 after
he resigned. Consequently, it makes little sense that the stock was issued nearly a year after he
had already resigned. Moreover, Keasberry identified the date as June 2017 in a declaration filed
in Nevada state court. *See* ECF No. 9-2 at 18.

1 Keasberry to fill all Gen2's officer positions. *Id.* Serruya and Kovacocy refused to step down
2 and instead took a series of actions to attempt to maintain control over Gen2. *Id.* at 13.
3 Consequently, in March 2021, Keasberry filed suit in Nevada state court seeking to have himself
4 and Jamani declared Gen2's valid officers and directors (the Control Action). *Id.*

5 For over four years after the original maturity date, Gaines and Lahr took no action to
6 enforce the promissory notes. *Id.* at 16. But on April 9, 2021, Gaines and Lahr filed suit in
7 Arizona state court against Keasberry (but not Gen2) on the guarantees. *Id.* at 16-17. Less than
8 two weeks later, Jamani made the first payment of \$20,000 to Keasberry under the stock
9 purchase agreement. *Id.* at 19. In July 2021, the Arizona court entered a default judgment
10 against Keasberry on the guarantees. *Id.* at 17.

11 In August 2021, Gaines and Lahr domesticated the Arizona default judgment in Nevada
12 state court (the Domestication Action). *Id.* In the meantime, Serruya and Kovacocy filed a
13 motion for temporary restraining order in the Control Action stating that they needed to remain
14 in control of Gen2 so they could file necessary documents with the Securities and Exchange
15 Commission (SEC). *Id.* at 13. Keasberry moved for summary judgment based on his right to
16 remove Serruya and Kovacocy as directors and officers based on the Series A Preferred stock
17 voting power. *Id.* at 13-14. The state court granted the injunction for Serruya and Kovacocy to
18 maintain the status quo and ensure Gen2 met its filing obligations. *Id.* at 14. It also allowed
19 Serruya to schedule an election, which Serruya scheduled for November 12, 2021. *Id.*

20 In September 2021, Gen2's stock transfer agent transferred the Series A stock to Jamani
21 pursuant to the stock transfer agreement between Jamani and Keasberry. *Id.* at 19. Just a few
22 days later, Gen2 filed a disclosure statement that revealed that Serruya and Kovacocy authorized
23 Gen2 to issue stock to Gaines and Lahr in 2020 and 2021 valued at \$225,000 each "for what

1 appears to be no consideration.” *Id.* at 19-20. Serruya also disclosed for the first time in an SEC
2 filing that he allegedly held superior voting power through Series A-1 stock that he had issued to
3 himself that purportedly would trump Keasberry’s Series A stock. *Id.* at 13-14. That led
4 Keasberry to file for relief in the Control Action, arguing that Serruya and Kovacocy were taking
5 actions aimed at undermining the state court’s injunction. *Id.* at 14-15.

6 Gaines and Lahr obtained a writ of execution in the Domestication Action to execute on
7 Keasberry’s property in Nevada to satisfy the Arizona judgment. *Id.* at 17. Gaines and Lahr’s
8 counsel “communicated with Serruya to coordinate the seizure of” both Keasberry’s common
9 stock as well as the Series A stock and sent the writ to Gen2 to seize Keasberry’s shares. *Id.*
10 According to the counterclaim, “Gaines and Lahr specifically sought the Series A Preferred
11 Stock, which they identified as a key asset.” *Id.* The night before the November 12 shareholder
12 election, Serruya sent Gaines and Lahr’s writ of execution to Gen2’s stock transfer agent
13 demanding that the agent convert the Series A stock to common shares held in the name of “Mr.
14 Keasberry c/o Shlomo S. Sherman, Esq.” *Id.* Sherman is Gaines and Lahr’s attorney. *Id.* at 18.
15 The agent refused to comply with Serruya’s request. *Id.*

16 The election proceeded on November 12. *Id.* at 15. Jamani voted based on the Series A
17 Preferred stock and Serruya voted based on the Series A-1 stock. *Id.* Serruya and Kovacocy
18 subsequently announced that they were reelected as Gen2’s directors. *Id.*

19 The state court thereafter held an evidentiary hearing in the Control Action and issued an
20 order granting Keasberry and Jamani’s summary judgment motion. *Id.* The court ruled that
21 Keasberry’s February 2021 action in removing Serruya from office was valid, so all of Serruya
22 and Kovacocy’s actions thereafter were voidable and Keasberry and Jamani were Gen2’s valid
23 directors. *Id.* at 15-16.

1 In July 2022, Gaines and Lahr filed this case, alleging that the transfer of the Series A
2 stock from Keasberry to Jamani was fraudulent. ECF No. 6. Keasberry and Jamani
3 counterclaimed, essentially asserting that Gaines and Lahr conspired with Serruya and Kovacocy
4 to seize the Series A stock to control Gen2. Gaines and Lahr now move to dismiss on a variety
5 of grounds. Serruya and Kovacocy have not appeared in this case.

6 **II. ANALYSIS**

7 In considering a motion to dismiss, I take all well-pleaded allegations of material fact as
8 true and construe the allegations in a light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Kwan v.*
9 *SanMedica Int'l*, 854 F.3d 1088, 1096 (9th Cir. 2017). However, I do not assume the truth of
10 legal conclusions merely because they are cast in the form of factual allegations. *Navajo Nation*
11 *v. Dep't of the Interior*, 876 F.3d 1144, 1163 (9th Cir. 2017). A plaintiff must make sufficient
12 factual allegations to establish a plausible entitlement to relief. *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550
13 U.S. 544, 556 (2007). Such allegations must amount to “more than labels and conclusions, [or] a
14 formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Id.* at 555.

15 Additionally, claims grounded in fraud must satisfy both this plausibility standard and
16 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9’s heightened pleading requirement to “state with particularity
17 the circumstances constituting fraud.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). “To properly plead fraud with
18 particularity under Rule 9(b), a pleading must identify the who, what, when, where, and how of
19 the misconduct charged, as well as what is false or misleading about the purportedly fraudulent
20 statement, and why it is false.” *Davidson v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 889 F.3d 956, 964 (9th Cir.
21 2018) (quotation omitted).

22 ////

23 ////

1 **A. Characterization of the Claims**

2 Gaines and Lahr contend that the claims against Serruya and Kovacocy are improperly
3 characterized as counterclaims because Serruya and Kovacocy are not plaintiffs. Gaines and
4 Lahr assert that Serruya and Kovacocy are third-party defendants. Keasberry and Jamani
5 respond that they can bring in new parties as counterdefendants and the only claim that qualifies
6 as a third-party claim is the one against Serruya and Kovacocy for equitable indemnity. They
7 request leave to amend to recharacterize the claim if necessary.

8 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 13(c), a “counterclaim need not diminish or defeat
9 the recovery sought by the opposing party” and “may request relief that exceeds in amount or
10 differs in kind from the relief sought by the opposing party.” Rule 13(h) allows for adding a
11 party to a counterclaim through Rules 19 and 20. In contrast, a third-party claim is one filed by
12 the “defending party” against “a nonparty who is or may be liable to it for all or part of the claim
13 against it.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 14(a)(1).

14 Gaines and Lahr are incorrect in stating that because the counterclaims add Serruya and
15 Kovacocy to the case, they must be third-party claims. Parties can be added as
16 counterdefendants under Rules 13(h), 19, and 20.⁴ Most of the counterclaims against Serruya
17 and Kovacocy are properly characterized as counterclaims and not third-party claims because
18 they do not assert that the two new parties are liable to Keasberry and Jamani for Gaines and
19 Lahr’s fraudulent transfer claims against Keasberry and Jamani. However, as Keasberry and
20 Jamani concede, the equitable indemnity claim is a third-party claim. With this understanding,

21
22
23

⁴ Gaines and Lahr have not argued that joinder is improper under Rules 19 and 20, so I do not
address that issue.

1 Keasberry and Jamani need not amend to clarify that the equitable indemnity claim is a third-
2 party claim, but they may do so as part of an amendment otherwise authorized by this order.

3 **B. Jurisdiction**

4 Gaines and Lahr argue that the court lacks jurisdiction over the counterclaims because
5 both Jamani and Serruya are Canadian citizens. Gaines and Lahr contend the counterclaims are
6 not compulsory, and to the extent supplemental jurisdiction applies, I should decline to exercise
7 that jurisdiction because the counterclaims do not arise out of the same case or controversy as the
8 fraudulent transfer claims and would predominate over the fraudulent transfer claims.

9 Keasberry and Jamani respond that because the main action seeks to obtain the Series A
10 Preferred stock and their counterclaims allege an unlawful conspiracy to deprive Jamani of that
11 stock, the counterclaims are compulsory, so no independent jurisdictional basis is needed.
12 Alternatively, they contend that even if the counterclaims are not compulsory, I should exercise
13 supplemental jurisdiction because the counterclaims arise out of the same controversy
14 surrounding the stock as the original claims.

15 Under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), if I have original jurisdiction over a civil action, then I also
16 have supplemental jurisdiction “over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action
17 within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article
18 III of the United States Constitution.”⁵ This includes “claims that involve the joinder or
19 intervention of additional parties,” including counterclaims and third-party claims. 28 U.S.C.
20 § 1367(a); *see also* *Ambassador Hotel Co. v. Wei-Chuan Inv.*, No. 97-56423, 191 F.3d 459, 1999

21
22 ⁵ There are exceptions to supplemental jurisdiction, but none apply here. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a)
23 (except “as expressly provided otherwise by Federal statute”); *id.* § 1367(b) (in civil actions
where jurisdiction is originally founded on diversity, I do not have supplemental jurisdiction over
certain claims brought by a plaintiff “when exercising supplemental jurisdiction over such claims
would be inconsistent with the jurisdictional requirements” of diversity jurisdiction).

1 WL 680286, at *1 (9th Cir. 1999). Claims form part of the same case or controversy where they
2 “derive from a common nucleus of operative fact” and are such that they “would ordinarily be
3 expected to [be tried] in one judicial proceeding.” *Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1209-10 (9th
4 Cir. 2021) (quotation omitted).

5 Regardless of whether Keasberry and Jamani’s counterclaims are characterized as
6 compulsory or permissive, they derive from a common nucleus of operative fact regarding
7 Gen2’s debt, Keasberry’s guarantee of that debt, Serruya’s conduct while in control and
8 attempting to retain control of Gen2, and how that impacts whether the stock transfer from
9 Keasberry to Jamani was fraudulent. For example, according to the counterclaims, Serruya
10 caused Gen2 to issue stock to Gaines and Lahr valued at \$225,000 each for no consideration.
11 The counterclaims allege that the stock transfers “were either payments to have them pursue
12 Keasberry in an effort to seize the Series A Preferred Stock, or payments on the Promissory
13 Notes but not applied to the debt so as to allow Gaines and Lahr to pursue Keasberry to steal the
14 Series A Preferred Stock.” ECF No. 7 at 20. If it is true that Gen2 paid Gaines and Lahr on the
15 debt, that may impact whether the stock transfer between Keasberry and Jamani was fraudulent
16 because some of Gaines and Lahr’s fraudulent transfer claims require proof that Keasberry was
17 insolvent at the time he transferred the Series A stock to Jamani. *See* ECF No. 6 at 6-7. If
18 Gen2’s debt was paid in full or part by the no-consideration stock transfers to Gaines and Lahr,
19 then Gaines and Lahr may not have been Keasberry’s creditors or Keasberry may not have been
20 insolvent because his outstanding debt on the guarantees would have been reduced or eliminated.

21 Additionally, the third-party equitable indemnification claim is, by its very nature, part of
22 the same controversy because it asserts that Gaines and Lahr’s claims against Keasberry are the
23 “result of the faults of Serruya and Kovacocy, as directors and officers of Gen2.” ECF No. 7 at

1 24. That claim is based on the allegations that Serruya and Kovacocy breached fiduciary duties
2 by not repaying Gen2's debts and instead paying themselves exorbitant compensation and
3 issuing stock to Gaines and Lahr for no compensation. *Id.* at 23. I therefore have supplemental
4 jurisdiction over the counterclaims and third-party claim.

5 Once I have determined that I have supplemental jurisdiction, I may decline to exercise it
6 for certain reasons. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). But here I will exercise jurisdiction over the
7 counterclaims and third-party claim. The parties have already litigated aspects of their disputes
8 in piecemeal fashion in three other court actions. It best serves the parties and judicial economy
9 to have all disputes resolved in this case rather than having Keasberry and Jamani initiate yet
10 another round of litigation.

11 **C. Claim Preclusion**

12 Gaines and Lahr argue that the counterclaims are precluded by two prior actions: (1) the
13 Domestication Action in which Gaines and Lahr domesticated the Arizona default judgment
14 against Keasberry and in which Jamani intervened, and (2) the Control Action that Keasberry
15 brought against Serruya and Kovacocy in Nevada state court regarding who had the right to
16 control Gen2. Gaines and Lahr argue that the civil conspiracy claim was actually litigated in the
17 Domestication Act, and that Keasberry and Jamani could have brought the same claims they now
18 raise in either of these two cases.

19 Keasberry and Jamani argue that neither the Domestication Action nor the Control Action
20 required them to assert the claims in this case as compulsory counterclaims, so they are not claim
21 precluded. As to the Domestication Action, they assert that Gaines and Lahr had no right to
22 pursue the Series A Preferred Stock that was in Jamani's name in that case, as the court in that
23 case found. As to the Control Action, they assert that a dispute over who controlled Gen2 was

1 separate from whether Serruya and Kovacocy abused their power while they were in control.
2 They also contend there is no final judgment on the merits in the Control Action. They argue the
3 cases do not involve the same parties because the Domestication Action did not involve Serruya
4 and Kovacocy, and the Control Action did not involve Gaines and Lahr. Finally, they contend
5 that claim preclusion does not apply when a party from the prior action does not learn of its
6 claim until after its pleading in the first case. Keasberry and Jamani assert that it was only after
7 all proceedings had commenced that they learned that Gen2 had issued stock to Gaines and Lahr
8 for no consideration.

9 The Control and Domestication Actions were filed in Nevada state court, while the
10 default judgment was obtained in Arizona. Consequently, Nevada rules of claim preclusion
11 apply to the Control and Domestication Actions, while Arizona rules apply to the default
12 judgment. *See White v. City of Pasadena*, 671 F.3d 918, 926 (9th Cir. 2012). Under both states'
13 law, the party asserting a judgment has preclusive effect bears the burden of proving it.
14 *Lawrence T. v. Dep't of Child Safety*, 438 P.3d 259, 261-62 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2019); *Bower v.*
15 *Harrah's Laughlin, Inc.*, 215 P.3d 709, 718 (Nev. 2009) (en banc), *modified on other grounds by*
16 *Garcia v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 293 P.3d 869 (Nev. 2013) (en banc). And both states apply
17 claim preclusion in similar circumstances where "(1) the final judgment is valid, (2) the
18 subsequent action is based on the same claims or any part of them that were or could have been
19 brought in the first case, and (3) the parties or their privies are the same in the instant lawsuit as
20 they were in the previous lawsuit, or the defendant can demonstrate that he or she should have
21 been included as a defendant in the earlier suit and the plaintiff fails to provide a good reason for
22 not having done so." *Weddell v. Sharp*, 350 P.3d 80, 85 (Nev. 2015) (simplified) (en banc); *see*
23 *also Lawrence T.*, 438 P.3d at 262.

1 Gaines and Lahr do not meet their burden with respect to any of the prior lawsuits. As to
2 the Nevada cases, they do not clearly identify who were parties or privies to each case, show that
3 the Control Action resulted in a final judgment, or establish what claims were or could have been
4 brought in which case between which parties. Instead, they attach to their motion a few
5 documents from the cases. ECF Nos. 9-1; 9-2; 9-3. As for the Arizona default judgment, Gaines
6 and Lahr do not show that Jamani, Serruya, or Kovacocy were parties or privies to that action or
7 that it involved the same issues. I will not search the state court dockets to make Gaines and
8 Lahr's arguments for them.

9 Additionally, Gaines and Lahr do not address Keasberry and Jamani's argument that they
10 could not have brought their claims in the other actions because they discovered the fact that
11 Gaines and Lahr received stock from Gen2 after they filed their responsive pleadings (or
12 defaulted) in the various actions. *See Mendenhall v. Tassinari*, 403 P.3d 364, 371 (Nev. 2017)
13 (noting an exception from claim preclusion "for claims acquired after the responsive pleadings,"
14 including when "a party does not know of a claim until after its pleading"); *Lansford v. Harris*,
15 850 P.2d 126, 132 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1992) (stating that "a claim must be mature to be compulsory"
16 and a claim that is not mature is not "subject to res judicata principles" (quotation omitted));
17 *Levin v. Hindhaugh*, 804 P.2d 839, 840 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1990) (stating that "a compulsory
18 counterclaim must be asserted" to avoid claim preclusion, but to be compulsory, the claim "must
19 be mature"). I therefore deny Gaines and Lahr's motion to dismiss based on claim preclusion.

20 **D. Failure to State a Claim**

21 1. Civil Conspiracy

22 Gaines and Lahr argue that this claim is not pleaded with particularity and there is no tort
23 or unlawful objective identified as the conspiracy's purpose. Alternatively, they contend that the

1 only purpose identified is their effort to execute on the Series A Preferred stock, but they assert
2 that this conduct is protected by the absolute litigation privilege. Finally, they assert there is no
3 plausible allegation of damages because they never obtained the Series A Preferred stock.

4 Keasberry and Jamani respond that they have adequately pleaded the claim that Gaines
5 and Lahr accepted Gen2 stock for no consideration without crediting that as payment on Gen2's
6 debt and then pursued the Series A Preferred Stock at a critical moment in the dispute over the
7 control of Gen2. They argue that the conspirators had the unlawful objective of converting
8 Jamani's Series A Preferred stock to obtain control of Gen2 and intended to abuse the court
9 process by pursuing the Domestication Action to aid Serruya and Kovacocy in the control
10 dispute. They assert they have alleged damages from this conspiracy because Gaines and Lahr
11 received payments from Gen2 that should have been applied to the notes underlying the
12 Domestication Action, and because they expended attorney's fees in the Domestication Action.
13 Keasberry and Jamani argue that the litigation privilege does not apply because they allege a
14 conspiracy to obtain an unlawful objective and because the Domestication Action was not
15 brought in good faith.

16 *a. Litigation Privilege*

17 The Supreme Court of Nevada has adopted "the long-standing common law rule that
18 communications uttered or published in the course of judicial proceedings are absolutely
19 privileged, rendering those who made the communications immune from civil liability."
20 *Greenberg Traurig v. Frias Holding Co.*, 331 P.3d 901, 903 (Nev. 2014) (en banc) (quotation
21 omitted). The privilege protects both "an attorney or a nonattorney" so long as the
22 communication at issue is "related to ongoing litigation or future litigation contemplated in good
23 faith." *Williams v. Lazer*, 495 P.3d 93, 100 (Nev. 2021) (en banc) (quotation omitted); *Bullivant*

1 *Houser Bailey PC v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. of State ex rel. Cnty. of Clark*, No. 57991, 381 P.3d
2 597, 2012 WL 1117467, at *3 (Nev. 2012) (stating that the privilege applies to “conduct
3 occurring during the litigation process” (emphasis and quotation omitted)). The privilege
4 protects from civil liability even knowingly false and malicious communications. *Greenberg*
5 *Traurig*, 331 P.3d at 903.

6 The privilege’s scope is “quite broad,” and I should apply it “liberally.” *Fink v. Oshins*,
7 49 P.3d 640, 644 (Nev. 2002). Consequently, when determining whether the privilege applies, I
8 resolve any doubt in favor of the privilege’s application. *Id.*

9 The privilege is not without limits, however. *Greenberg Traurig*, 331 P.3d at 903. The
10 Supreme Court of Nevada has declined to apply it under circumstances that are “inconsistent
11 with the public policy behind the privilege.” *Dickerson v. Downey Brand LLP*, No. 67768, 408
12 P.3d 543, 2017 WL 6316552, at *3 (Nev. 2017). “The litigation privilege is designed to ensure
13 that attorneys have the utmost freedom to engage in zealous advocacy and are not constrained in
14 their quest to fully pursue the interests of, and obtain justice for, their clients.” *Id.* (quotation
15 omitted). But it “is not designed to provide attorneys with the ability to act malfeasant and then
16 hide behind the privilege with impunity.” *Id.* The Supreme Court of Nevada thus declined to
17 apply the privilege where an attorney “manipulated his position of influence with [an expert] and
18 [the attorney’s clients] in order to lower [the expert’s] fees, raise his own fees, and, presumably,
19 allow his clients funds they otherwise were not entitled to keep.” *Id.* Likewise, the privilege
20 does not apply to a conspiracy to falsify nontestimonial evidence or “an expert’s fraudulent
21 acts.” *Harrison v. Roitman*, 362 P.3d 1138, 1143 n.6 (2015) (en banc).

22 To determine whether the privilege applies, I also should examine whether the
23 “gravamen” of the complaint is based on non-privileged actions rather than potentially privileged

1 communications. *Dickerson*, 2017 WL 6316552, at *4. For example, in *Dickerson*, the claims
2 against the attorney were “not based on attorney-client communications or any communications
3 between [the attorney] and [his clients] in which he provided legal advice.” *Id.* Rather, the
4 claims were “based on [the attorney] and [his clients’] failures to uphold the settlement
5 agreement” through which the expert was to be paid. *Id.* The attorney thus “did more than just
6 advise his clients that they had the option of not paying [the expert]; instead, he caused them to
7 breach the contract by mendacious behavior.” *Id.* Under those circumstances, the Supreme Court
8 of Nevada concluded the district court did not err by refusing to apply the privilege. *Id.*

9 To the extent this claim is based on Gaines and Lahr filing the Arizona lawsuit and the
10 Domestication Action, that is protected by the absolute litigation privilege. Keasberry and
11 Jamani’s argument that Gaines and Lahr were not acting in good faith when they filed the
12 lawsuits is misplaced. The absolute litigation privilege protects even malicious conduct. The
13 reference to good faith in Nevada’s absolute litigation privilege caselaw concerns whether a pre-
14 litigation statement is made in relation to future litigation that is contemplated in good faith.
15 Here, Gaines and Lahr were not just contemplating litigation, they pursued it.

16 However, Keasberry and Jamani allege some conduct that is not protected by the
17 privilege. They allege that Gaines and Lahr accepted stock from Gen2 without crediting the
18 stock’s value to the debt Gen2 owed and that Keasberry guaranteed. That conduct was unrelated
19 to ongoing or future litigation and applying the policy behind the privilege does not support
20 extending it to that conduct. Additionally, Gaines and Lahr allegedly used the writ to seek to
21 attach Jamani’s property rather than Keasberry’s. Although this allegation is related to Gaines
22 and Lahr obtaining the writ in the Domestication Action against Keasberry, the gravamen of the
23 allegation is not based on the litigation-related communications. Rather, it is based on the out-

1 of-court course of conduct in trying to misuse the writ to try to obtain Jamani's property. That is
2 akin to the conduct the Supreme Court of Nevada has held is not protected by the privilege.

3 I therefore grant in part and deny in part Gaines and Lahr's motion to dismiss based on
4 the absolute litigation privilege. To the extent the civil conspiracy claim is based on Gaines and
5 Lahr's conduct in filing the Arizona lawsuit or the Domestication Action, it is dismissed with
6 prejudice because it is barred by the absolute litigation privilege. To the extent the claim is
7 based on Gaines and Lahr accepting payment from Gen2 in the form of stock without crediting
8 that to Gen2's debt or trying to use the writ to obtain Jamani's Series A stock, then it is not
9 barred.

10 *b. Failure to State a Claim*

11 Under Nevada law, a civil conspiracy "consists of a combination of two or more persons
12 who, by some concerted action, intend to accomplish an unlawful objective for the purpose of
13 harming another, and damage results from the act or acts." *Consol. Generator-Nevada, Inc. v.*
14 *Cummins Engine Co.*, 971 P.2d 1251, 1256 (Nev. 1998) (per curiam) (quotation omitted). The
15 unlawful objective does not necessarily need to be a tort.⁶ *Cadle Co. v. Woods & Erickson, LLP*,
16 345 P.3d 1049, 1052 (Nev. 2015) (en banc).

17 The conspiracy counterclaim alleges that Gaines, Lahr, Serruya and Kovacocy conspired
18 to "steal the Series A Preferred Stock so that Serruya and Kovacocy could remain in their
19 director and officer positions at Gen2." ECF No. 7 at 19. According to the counterclaim, this
20 was done through Gaines and Lahr using the writ from the Domestication Action to attempt to
21 seize the Series A stock during a critical moment in the control fight, in exchange for Serruya
22

23 ⁶ Gaines and Lahr thus are incorrect when they state in their motion that to state a civil
conspiracy claim, Keasberry and Jamani must allege an underlying tort. *See* ECF No. 9 at 16.

1 and Kovacocy authorizing Gen2 to issue stock to Gaines and Lahr for no consideration. *Id.* at 17-
2 20. The counterclaim alleges that the unlawful objective was “to seize the Series A Preferred
3 Stock and, consequently, control of Gen2.” *Id.* at 20.

4 This claim suffers a defect that infects both the counterclaims and the parties’ briefs. It
5 lumps the parties together in circumstances where the parties’ rights, duties, and interests are not
6 necessarily the same. For example, in relation to the alleged attempt to seize the stock, if
7 Keasberry no longer owned the stock, it is unclear how he was harmed by attempts to seize it.
8 Similarly, the claim does not identify what damages the conspiracy caused Jamani because the
9 attempt at seizing his stock failed. *Id.* at 17-18 (alleging that the stock transfer agent refused
10 Serruya’s request to transfer the Series A stock the night before the election). Keasberry and
11 Jamani cannot cure these defects through explanations in their opposition. *See Applied*
12 *Underwriters, Inc. v. Lichtenegger*, 913 F.3d 884, 897 (9th Cir. 2019).

13 I therefore grant Gaines and Lahr’s motion to dismiss this claim. However, because it is
14 not clear that amendment would be futile, I grant Keasberry and Jamani leave to amend. *Sonoma*
15 *Cnty. Ass’n of Retired Emps. v. Sonoma Cnty.*, 708 F.3d 1109, 1118 (9th Cir. 2013) (“As a
16 general rule, dismissal without leave to amend is improper unless it is clear . . . that the
17 complaint could not be saved by any amendment.” (simplified)).

18 2. Aiding and Abetting

19 Gaines and Lahr argue the aiding and abetting claim depends on the breach of fiduciary
20 duty claim against Serruya and Kovacocy, which fails under the business judgment rule. They
21 also argue there are no plausibly alleged nonconclusory facts about how they aided and abetted
22 Serruya and Kovacocy’s breach of fiduciary duty. Finally, they assert that this claim is barred by
23 the statute of limitations.

1 Keasberry and Jamani argue that Serruya and Kovacocy owed fiduciary duties to
 2 Keasberry and Jamani as shareholders and directors of Gen2, and they breached those duties by
 3 failing to repay Gen2's debt and instead enriching themselves. They contend that Gaines and
 4 Lahr knowingly participated in the breach by not seeking repayment from Gen2 and accepting
 5 stock from Gen2 but not applying that value to the debt. Finally, they argue that the claim
 6 cannot be dismissed at this stage based on the statute of limitations.

7 *a. Statute of Limitations*

8 "A claim may be dismissed as untimely pursuant to a 12(b)(6) motion only when the
 9 running of the statute of limitations is apparent on the face of the complaint." *United States ex*
 10 *rel. Air Control Techs., Inc. v. Pre Con Indus., Inc.*, 720 F.3d 1174, 1178 (9th Cir. 2013)
 11 (simplified). A limitations period begins to run "from the day the cause of action accrued."
 12 *Clark v. Robison*, 944 P.2d 788, 789 (Nev. 1997) (per curiam). A cause of action generally
 13 accrues "when the wrong occurs and a party sustains injuries for which relief could be sought."
 14 *Petersen v. Bruen*, 792 P.2d 18, 20 (Nev. 1990); *see also State ex rel. Dep't of Transp. v. Pub.*
 15 *Emps.' Ret. Sys. of Nev.*, 83 P.3d 815, 817 (Nev. 2004) (en banc) ("A cause of action 'accrues'
 16 when a suit may be maintained thereon." (quotation omitted)). Outside the context of the
 17 attorney-client relationship, a "breach of fiduciary duty is fraud" and is therefore subject to a
 18 three-year statute of limitation. *Nev. State Bank v. Jamison Fam. P'ship*, 801 P.2d 1377, 1382
 19 (Nev. 1990) (per curiam) (citing Nev. Rev. Stat. § 11.190(3)(d)). "However, the statute of
 20 limitation will not commence to run until the aggrieved party knew, or reasonably should have
 21 known, of the facts giving rise to the breach." *Id.*

22 The breach of fiduciary duty and related aiding and abetting claims allege facts taking
 23 place within three years of the counterclaim, including Serruya and Kovacocy causing Gen2 to

1 pay its officers and directors millions of dollars in 2020, failing to pay Gen2's debts while
 2 enriching themselves, and issuing stock to Gaines and Lahr in 2020 and 2021 for no
 3 consideration. ECF No. 7 at 12, 16, 19. I therefore deny this portion of Gaines and Lahr's
 4 motion because it is not apparent from the face of the counterclaim that this claim is untimely.

5 *b. Failure to State a Claim*

6 "Aiding and abetting the breach of a fiduciary duty has four required elements: (1) there
 7 must be a fiduciary relationship between two parties, (2) that the fiduciary breached, (3) the
 8 defendant third party knowingly and substantially participated in or encouraged that breach, and
 9 (4) the plaintiff suffered damage as a result of the breach." *Guilfoyle v. Olde Monmouth Stock*
 10 *Transfer Co.*, 335 P.3d 190, 198 (Nev. 2014) (en banc). To establish the second element that
 11 Serruya and Kovacocy breached their fiduciary duties, the counterclaim must plausibly allege
 12 facts that (1) "rebut the business judgment rule" and (2) "demonstrate a breach of fiduciary duty
 13 involving intentional misconduct, fraud, or another knowing violation of the law." *Guzman v.*
 14 *Johnson*, 483 P.3d 531, 535-36 (Nev. 2021) (en banc) (citing Nev. Rev. Stat. § 78.138(7)). "The
 15 business judgment rule states that 'directors and officers, in deciding upon matters of business,
 16 are presumed to act in good faith, on an informed basis and with a view to the interests of the
 17 corporation.'" *Chur v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. in & for Cnty. of Clark*, 458 P.3d 336, 340 (Nev.
 18 2020) (en banc) (quoting Nev. Rev. Stat. § 78.138(3)).

19 The breach of fiduciary claim alleges that Serruya and Kovacocy owed fiduciary duties to
 20 Keasberry as a shareholder of Gen2. ECF No. 7 at 21. Serruya and Kovacocy allegedly breached
 21 this duty by enriching themselves while failing to pay Gen2's debts. *Id.* The aiding and abetting
 22 claim alleges that Serruya and Kovacocy breached a fiduciary duty to Keasberry, that Gaines and
 23 Lahr knew that conduct breached duties owed to "Counterclaimants," and that Gaines and Lahr

1 intentionally assisted the breach of a duty owed to “Plaintiff.” *Id.* at 23. It then alleges that as a
 2 result, “Counterclaimants” have been damaged. *Id.* at 24. It thus is unclear who is asserting this
 3 claim and in what capacity.⁷ In their opposition brief, Keasberry and Jamani assert that fiduciary
 4 duties were owed to both of them as shareholders and directors of Gen2. ECF No. 11 at 19.
 5 These shifting allegations and arguments do not give Gaines and Lahr fair notice of who is
 6 asserting the claim, in what capacity, and on what factual basis. *See Echlin v. PeaceHealth*, 887
 7 F.3d 967, 977 (9th Cir. 2018) (stating that a complaint must “give the defendant fair notice of
 8 what the plaintiff’s claim is and the grounds upon which it rests” (quotation omitted)). I
 9 therefore dismiss this claim, with leave to amend.

10 3. Claims Against Serruya and Kovacocy

11 Keasberry and Jamani argue that Gaines and Lahr have no standing to seek dismissal of
 12 the counterclaims against Serruya and Kovacocy. I decline to consider arguments Gaines and
 13 Lahr make on behalf of Serruya and Kovacocy except for the aiding and abetting claim because
 14 it is based on Serruya and Kovacocy’s breach of fiduciary duty. Keasberry and Jamani are
 15 granted leave to amend the breach of fiduciary duty claim against Serruya and Kovacocy
 16 consistent with my ruling on the aiding and abetting claim. Gaines and Lahr did not move to
 17 dismiss the equitable indemnity claim, nor would they have standing to do so, so that claim
 18 remains pending.

19 ////

21 ⁷ Generally, “a corporate director or officer owes fiduciary duties to the corporation, not the
 22 shareholders, and the shareholders may enforce the fiduciary duties through derivative actions.”
 23 *Parametric Sound Corp. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. in & for Cnty. of Clark*, 401 P.3d 1100, 1105
 n.10 (Nev. 2017) (en banc). There may be circumstances where a director or officer owes
 fiduciary duties to a shareholder. *Id.* If this is meant to be a derivative action, then the
 counterclaimants should make that clear in an amended pleading. *See id.* at 1106-08 (discussing
 the difference between direct and derivative claims).

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 I THEREFORE ORDER that the plaintiffs' motion to dismiss (**ECF No. 9**) is
3 **GRANTED in part** as set forth in this order.

4 I FURTHER ORDER that counterclaimants Brian Keasberry and Aarif Jamani may file
5 amended counterclaims by August 25, 2023.

6 DATED this 25th day of July, 2023.

7 

8 _____
9 ANDREW P. GORDON
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23